

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/646,021	08/22/2003	Robert H. Ray	RAY-001	9250
24739	7590 07/10/2006		EXAMINER	
	COAST PATENT AG	CHAPMAN, JEANETTE E		
	PO BOX 187 AROMAS, CA 95004		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			3635	
		DATE MAILED: 07/10/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/646,021	RAY ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
•		3635				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	Chapman E. Jeanette					
Period for Reply	ears on are cover sheet what are c	orrespondence address –				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tirr rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	lely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 Ap	nril 2006					
·- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	•					
,—	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>21-3</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>21-3</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
•						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
	·					
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)						
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date.						
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ratent Application (PTO-152)				
. apor rioto/mini bato	<u> </u>					

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 21, 26, 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. New claims 21-31 are replete with new matter having no support in the original specification. For example, the "elongated embed" and the last 3 lines of claim 1 have no antecedent basis in the original specification. The specification speaks of an elongated member not an elongated "embed". The subject matter of claim 22 regarding the material of construction and the elasticity has no antecedent basis in the original specification. The specification discloses elastic material but not molded elastic material. There are other instances of discrepencies between the specification and what is in the claims. Applicant has not addressed those in claims 29-31. The above errors were examples of just a few.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Application/Control Number: 10/646,021 Page 3

Art Unit: 3635

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 21, 23, 25, 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Valentz (6324800) discloses a system for anchoring a structural member capable of being formed from below the ground comprising:

- A vertically disposed anchor footing 10 having a lower base portion and an upper neck portion; (see annotations on patent copy)
- An elongated embed 102, post or pole, longitudinally disposed within the anchor footing along the vertical center of the anchor footing 10
- A coupling interface 200/216 affixed to one end of the elongate embed for fixing the structural member to the anchor footing
- The anchor footing has a predetermined amount of horizontal flex ability, against horizontal force acting on the structural member
- The flex amount determined by the physical properties of the elongate embed disposed therein;
- The anchor footing is pyramidal in shape
- The base portion is substantially larger than the neck
- the plurality of posts and thus a plurality of anchoring systems, see figure 5

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Application/Control Number: 10/646,021

Art Unit: 3635

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 22, 24, 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Valentz et al (6324800). The method of making and the material of construction are viewed as a matter of choice. One of ordinary skill in the art would have appreciated making the anchor of any suitable and known material which would enable the corresponding and intended function. Further, the method of making is not a top of focus for a claim directed to an article. One of ordinary skill in the art would have appreciated making the anchor using any well known process which would enable the intended structure to be produced.

However, Valentz et al discloses a supporting base or anchor foot made of a moldable polymeric material. The elasticity thereof is controllable to a degree by a particular size of the molding material, and the degree of mold pressure used. No binder or filler is used. However, the same result is achieved without the binder.

Applicant does not discloses the significance or criticality of the binder and the same is viewed as a matter of choice. It would have been obvious to employ another material of construction as taught by Valentz et al to provide a portable, high strength but to some degree flexible base.

Claims 29—31 are grossly replete with new matter and will not be addressed in this application.

Applicant's arguments are moot given the new ground of rejection.

Art Unit: 3635

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chapman E. Jeanette whose telephone number is 571-272-6841. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-thursday, 8:30-6:00, every fri. off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Friedman Carl can be reached on 571-272-6842. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

jec

Jaanette Chapman
Primary Examiner